Secrets. H-27—45,806—19-10-39.

Home **(1940) Department.**

M.S **SERIES.**

G.O. No.	4501
Dated	9-11-1940

4924/1941 P.21

[Despatch Abstract.]

Jails - Establishment - Arokiaswami, ex-warder, Central Jail, Bellary - Appeal against dismissal - Defects in procedure pointed out and fresh enquiry ordered.

C.F. 30.

Jail **DEPARTMENT.**



Received ..... 19 *Registered* 25722 19.

Subject.

Appeal - Arokiasamy - Ex-warder - Central Jail, Bellary - forwarded.

***

ENCLOSURES.
No. .....
.....
Spare copies .....

R.O.C.No. 2548-B2-40.

Station Madras, *Dated the* 10th September 19 40.

From (Name) Lieut.-Col.S.C.Contractor, M.B., I.M.S.,
(Designation) Inspector General of Prisons.

To The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Home Department.

Sir,

I forward herewith an appeal petition received from Arokiasamy, ex-warder No.5 of the Central Jail, Bellary, which is addressed to the Chief Secretary to Government. The warder was charged for wilful negligence of duty in that he allowed a prisoner to escape from the jail. The Superintendent of the jail who conducted the enquiry reduced the warder from Rs.22/- to Rs.20/- for a period of 2 years from 1-4-1940. But I ordered that the warder should be dismissed from

from service - vide copy of my letter No.1142-S2-40 dated 9-5-1940 enclosed. Against this order, the warder put in a petition to reconsider the orders of dismissal passed on him. I turned down his request. vide copy of my letter No.L.Dis. 1910-40 dated 19-6-1940 enclosed.

2/ The connected papers of enquiry and the defaulter sheet of the warder are also enclosed.

Lieut.-Col., I.M.S.,
Inspector General of Prisons.

Copy of letter No.L.Dis.1910/B2/40, dated 19th June 1940. to the Supdt., Central Jail, Bellary.

Sub: Appeal petition from ex-warder 5 - Arokiaswamy, Central Jail, Bellary -

Read Superintendent's Endorsement No.1755 dated 8-6-1940.

***

The Inspector General of Prisons declines to reconsider the order of dismissal passed on the appellant (ex-warder No.5 Arokiaswamy)

AA/11-9.

Bellary,
10th August40 2



To

The Chief Secretary,

Government Of Madras,

M A D R A S.

Through

The Honarary Secretary,

Discharged Prisoner's Aid Society,

B e l l a r y,

The Superintendent,

Central Jail,

Bellary,

and Inspector General Of Prison's,

M A D R A S.

Honoured Sir, (V)

I beg to resubmit my mercy appeal ~~petition~~ to your Honour's kind consideration and favourable orders with reference to your letter No. 1983/C.1 dated. 22nd July 1940.

For which act of kindness I will be ever thankful and prayful for your longivity and properity.

I beg to remain
Honoured Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

Arogiaswamy
2-8-40

From:-
Arogiaswamy,
Ex-Warder No.5,
C/o Honarary Secretary,
Discharged Prisoner's Aid Society,
B E L L A R Y.

Page

Bellary,
12th July 1940.

19831C

To,

The Chief Secretary,

Government Of Madras,

MADRAS.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT.
13 JUL 1940
CHIEF SECRETARIAT

Through,

The Honorary Secretary,

Discharged Prisoner's Aid Society,

BELLARY.

Honoured Sir,

Sub:- Arogiaswamy - Ex.Warder No.5. - Central Jail - Bellary - Mercy Appeal Pettition.

I beg to bring these few following lines to Your Honour's kind, sympethetic consideration and favourable orders, with reference to the final orders of the Inspector General of Prisons Madras,No.L.Dis.1910/B.2./40.dated 19-6-1940, and Superintendent Central Jail,Bellary,No.1755.dated 8-6-40 and No.G.1947 dated 22-6-40.

I beg to state that on 28-3-1940 was entrusted with the Thoti Gang. I brought the gang consisting of 5 convicts out of the Jail at about 12-30. P.M.

As per usual custom I with my gang went to the Warder's Line and poured water to the trees to the Hindu Temple. And at about 2-30.P.M.I straight away marched to the Superintendents Bunglow. This Bunglow is situated at a far off distance at about 3/4 mile behind the Jail, in an out of the way place.

The convict No.5449 I.Y.Venkataswamy repeatedly requested me to allow him to answer calls of nature. I told him that I could not do so there, for this Bunglow is in between the District Judge and Deputy Inspector General of Police, quarters. But at the same time promised to allow him near the Ejector. Then with my gang I was about to clear the servants Latrine,which is situated at about 500 yards away from the Superintendents Bunglow, And this Latrine is sorrounded on all sides by tall, thickly,overgrown bushy aloes.

The convict No.5449 insistantly asked me to permit him, I finding no other go could not but allow him. The Convict went behind the aloe, even then I did not loose sight of him, and he was seated in front of me at a distance of 20 yards from me and

and the latrine, and the rest of the four convicts were engaged in clearing the Latrine.

The 4 convicts after completely clearing the Latrine came and informed me, that they have finished their work. I went inside for verification and came out. Within the short interval of time, he made his escape and I called him twice, and receiving no reply ran to the spot where he was seated to attend calls of nature. I could find all his uniform except his towel with which he had ~~xx~~ escaped.

I immediately sounded the alarm whistle and came running to the Superintendents Bunglow, with the remaining four convicts. At that time Warder No.26.Mr.Shaffi was in charge of the Superintenden gang.He was working with three convicts. I told him that the convict No.5449 had escaped,and immediately marched with the four convicts to the Central Jail, and after handing over the four convicts to the chief warder, tried to the best of my ability to find out the escaped convict, and ran in search of him for more than 12 miles. But I came to know that the convict was caught near Nagari station with in few hours, then I returned to the jail.

17-18 (Y) The Warder No.26. Mr.Shaffi had given a statement that I was far away from my gang. This statement is highly unimaginable and wrong, for he did not know this fact that the convict had escaped ~~xx~~ till I informed him. He was all the while working inside the up-stairs of the Superintendents Bunglow which is at far off distance of more than 500 yards, giving instructions to the 3 convicts as to how to do the work. Above all I was working with my gang sorrounded by tall, bushy over grown aloes, and it is not possible to think ~~xxx~~ that ~~xxx~~ I with my convicts was within the reach of his eye sight. It is really a shock to me as to how he could have given such a statement.

In this connection I beg to bring to Your Honours kind consideration, that I was mainly alloted to the Ejector duty, with 5 convicts. All this mishap could never have been happened, if I had not asked to do the work, for which I was not entitled. But I being - a subordinate could not but do what all for which I was ordered to do, by the Superintendent. This mishap had happened for I had obeyed implicitly the orders of the Superintendent. If all the convicts had excaped in such a lonely, bushy, forest ,like place a

my position could have been worse.

Above all I beg to state that the escaped convict No.5449 had repeatedly said to me that he was a Chenchu by caste, and he was unwilling to the the Scavanging duty, for it was no the Profession of their caste. I had reported this fact, to my Higher authorities for four times, on every day. But the Higher Authorities threatend me, and asked me to extract work from those convicts who were entrusted to me, immeterial of their caste,and profession. I bein a subordinate finding no other go could not but obey my Superiors Officer's. The Convict too finding no other go, and unwilling to do the work of a Scavanger,had escaped , though he knew that his release was fast approaching.

I beg to state that the 4 convicts No.5297,5313. 5315. 5369. had given a Statement , as to how the escape took place, and they too have stated that the actual distance between me and the escaped convict was within 20 yards,in my presence to the Superintendent. The convict who was recaptured within 24 hours too had given a statement in the Sub-Magistrate court to the effect that I had allowed him to sit in fornt of me within a short distance. The stationary Sub-Magistrate asked the convict the distance between me and the convict. He told that the distance was the same as the distance between the 2 bars in that court, which is within 20 Yards.

I am an Ex-Reformatory boy . I was sent to the Reformatory School at Chingelpet on 26-11-1911 and I was discharged on 16-9-19 On the same date I was appointed as a Beguler at Trichynopoly Central Jail.

If Your Honour doubts of these circumstances stated above can verify these facts, as your Honour pleases.

I have put in 24 years service in the variousCentral Jails, and I was discharging my duties consciously to the entire satisfaction of my Higher Authorities.

I am a poor man having many children and dependents, and I was supporting them in these hard Famine days with the greatest difficulty with my stipulated pay.

Above all I beg to bring before Your Honour, that I am thrown out of my employment, at this state of juncture, I cannot

cannot get any employment. Myself and my Family members will be put to the necessity of almost starving to death, after puting so many Yaars service.

I beg to state that I am a native of Trichynopoly, and at present I am in Bellary, which is like a foreign land to me, and is situated faraway from it. Here I have no relative or friend to help me in such a distressed state of condition. Even If I and my family members consisting of Young children and old People were to go from door to door begging-for-alms throughout Bellary District cannot get the Railway Freight required to go to my native place trichynopoly.

Under these circumstances stated above as I have none other than Your Honour to whom I represent all my grievances. I humblyxx request. prav. and prostrate before Your Honour including my family members ,without making me as an example to other Warder as per the dismissal orders of the Inspector General of Prisons, to reconsider my case taking into account my age, the length of service, the clean record which I possess, and the Pension for which I will be shortly entitled, and pass favourable orders,and thus relieve me from the disrssed state of condition in which myself and my family members are.

For which act of kindness I will be ever thankful and pray for your longivity, and Prosperisty.

I beg to remain,
Honoured Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

From.
Arogiaswamy,
Ex-Warder No.5,
BellaryCentral Jail,
C/o.Honorary Secretary,
Discharged Prisoner's Aid Society,
Bellary.

Forwarded for favourable disposal
J. Varaiah Secretary D.P.A. Bellary
12.7.40

44

A.R. 25/9.

Home Dept.

Memo/ 25/22 C-1 dt 25.9.40.

Arokiaswamy, Ex-warder, Central Jail, Bellary – Appeal against dismissal – Letter from the Dt J Tuticorin. R.C No 25 CS-B2-40 dt 6.9.40.

J.K. 25/9.

C.F

The Petitioner ~~clerk~~ has a right of appeal to the Govt with regard to para 12 of G.O No 1112 Pub(Ser) dt 7.7.38 and the Hon. Chief Sec. Comm will be addressed. The Dt J is requested to forward this office file containing his order dismissing the warder from service together with any other relevant papers on the subject.

3-C 24 K.

for
15.9.40.

To the Dt J of Tuticorin
R after (month.



F. 32 (a).

Jail DEPARTMENT. 9

In reply, please quote number, date and short title.

Received ..... *Registered* 25699 C 5 6

From (Name) Lieut.-Col.S.C.Contractor,M.B.,I.M.S.,

(Designation) Inspector General of Prisons,

Post Box ..... (STATION) Madras.

Telegraphic Address .....

ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO GOVT. - OCT. 1940 HOME DEPARTMENT

To

The Secretary to the Government of Madras,
Home Department.

R.O.C.No. 2548-B2/40 *dated* 3rd October 1940.

Sir,

Sub: Arokiasamy - ex-warder - Central Jail, Bellary - appeal against dismissal.

Ref:-Memorandum No.25722-C.1, Home dated 25-9-1940.

p.e n t

***

ENCLOSURES .....

SPARE COPIES .....

(A)

This office file (L.Dis.1142-40) dated 20-5-1940 containing my order dismissing the warder from service is herewith sent for perusal and return.

Lieut.-Col., I.M.S.,
Inspector General of Prisons.

AA/4-10.

Home Dept.

pp 1 to 2 Cf [25722] from the DS. Chittoor Roc No. 2546/B2/60 dt 10-9-60.

Jails - Estt. - Arokiaswami, ex-warder, Central Jail, Bellary - Appeals against the order of dismissal passed by the DS.

Arokiaswami, ex-warder of the Central Jail, Bellary, was reduced by the Supdt. of the Jail from Rs 22 to Rs 20/- for a period of 2 years from 1-4-60 for wilful neglect of duty in allowing a convict to escape. The convict was subsequently recaptured. The charges framed against the ex-warder are at p-26 (X). The enquiry proceedings are at pp 8-25 (X) and the Supdt's findings at pp 33-34 (X). But the DS. enhanced the punishment by ordering the dismissal of Arokiaswami. The warder has put in a service of about 23 years.

p-36 (X)

pp-6-7 (X)

p-39 (X)

'A' on p-35 (X)

2. Against the DS.'s order, the ex-warder has sent an appeal to Govt. As the DS.'s order was not passed on any appeal preferred to him by Arokiaswami, it shd be treated as an original order of punishment and an appeal lies to Govt. Please see para 12 of Fr. 1112 Part (Secl) dt 7-7-39. Under regulation 20(a) of the Madras P.S.C Regulations, 1937, the Comm. should be consulted when the Provincial Govt. pass an order on appeal. Before the Commn is advised,

'pp 4-7 Cf

pp 3-4 (K)

p-50 Services Manual, Vol II

KB 14.9.60

4 /

the D.G. in file containing his order dismissing the
warder from service and any other relevant / papers on the subject may be obtained.

A draft memo is held

from
4.9.40.

Issued as memo No. 25722-C, dy 25.9.40. p. 8 ante
[280 by C] from the D.G. of Prisons Rc. No. 25268/B2/40 p. 17
dy 3-10-40

Please see the memo ante p. 8 and the
D.G.'s office file L.Dis. 1142-40 dy 20.5.40 at (A)
As regards the order of dismissal please see pp 3 & 29 (A)
pp 3 and 29 of the file. ~~The case has to be~~
~~submitted to the Govt. for advice. Please~~
~~see para 2 of the office note above. A draft~~
~~letter to the Secy. to the Govt. is submitted for~~
~~approval~~ / the facts of the case are summarised below:-

kk
1.10.40

Convict Venkataswamy escaped from the
Bellary jail on 28.3.40 / the warder
He was recaptured by the police the same day. p 5 ante (X)

from whose charge the convict escaped was
No 5 Anjaneyaswamy the appellant. His statement
was taken by the Supt on 29.3.40. On the p 5-A (X)
same day, the Supt took the statements of
Convict Venkataswamy referred to above, p 12 ante (X)
and from 3 other convicts and a warder (Shafi) pp 16-25 ante (X)
warder No 5 (appellant) did not depose to
cross examine warder Shafi. A charge p 25 ante (X)
A

p 26 at (X) was framed against the appellant on 12.4.40 &
p 22-24 (A) he was directed to show cause why he should not be dismissed from service for wilful neglect of duty in allowing a convict to escape. Under the penalties and appeal rules, the Supt of the jail is the authority competent to dismiss a warder and the DJ is the appellate authority. In his letter dt 13.4.40, the Supt of the jail reported to the DJ as follows:-

p 28 at (X) "I have framed charges against the warder for slackness of duty and on receiving his explanation, I intend reducing him in grade (from Rs 22 to Rs 20) for one year."

p 31 at (X) In his letter dt 19.4.40, the DJ told the Supt that the warder was proved to be very slack and negligent in his duty and deserved no punishment other than dismissal from service. The Supt was asked to state whether there were any extenuating circumstances for not dismissing the warder.

p 35 at (X) The Supt reported that in view of the warder's long service of 23 years the ends of justice would be met if he was reduced from Rs 22 to Rs 20 for two years. The warder's explanation dt 17.4.40 is on pp 29-30 & the Supt's finding at 33-34 at (X). While in the charge sheet, the warder is charged with 'wilful neglect of duty', in the Supt's finding he is charged with 'carelessness'.

p 26 at (X)
p 34 at top
p 39 at (X)
p 22 at (A) In his proceedings dt 5.5.40, the DJ passed orders that

the offence committed by the warder was a grave one and had been proved and that the warder should be dismissed from service without any further consideration. It was also ordered in the DI's proceedings that "this punishment will also serve as an example to other warders". p 29 of (A)

2. It has to be examined whether the requirements of rule 55 of the Classification rules have been complied with. This rule says inter alia that the person charged should be required to state whether he desires an oral enquiry or only to be heard in person. In the enquiry proceedings, there is no reference to oral enquiry or personal hearing. The rule also says that "the proceedings shall contain a sufficient record of the evidence and a statement of the findings and the grounds thereof". In the superintendent's finding, there is some discussion of the evidence. The DI's proceedings however, do not refer to evidence. It is to be seen whether the defects mentioned above will be considered serious enough to vitiate the proceedings. p 436 - 437 Vol II. p 32 of (A) p 25 ibid.

3. As stated in para 2 of this note on file, the Govt are the appellate authority in this case. Under rule 4(c) of the Penalties & Appeals rules, the appellate authority should consider whether the penalty is excessive, adequate or inadequate. In this the Commission's advice is to be obtained under regulation 20(a) of the Union Public Service Commission regulations, 1937. p 49 of the Hand book Vol II p 250 of Hand book Vol II

A draft letter to be issued.

for

Rule 53 has not been observed in this case. The following are the breaches committed.

(a) The accused another warden and the delinquent were examined by the Supt on 29.3.40 at an enquiry before the charge was framed. The delinquent was not afforded an opportunity of Knowing then nor is it evident whether he was present throughout.

(b) The charge was framed on the strength of the evidence & the warden was only asked to show cause in writing why he should not be dismissed. The charge thus violates rule 53 for it afforded no adequate opportunity to the delinquent of defending himself.

(c) The delinquent was not asked whether he desired an oral enquiry or only to be heard in person.

(d) No oral enquiry was held after the charge was framed nor was the warden heard. No opportunity of Knowing what was given to the delinquent nor was he given an opportunity to address

£ 15.

any evidence.

The fact that an inmate escaped is admitted, but the question for decision was whether it was due to the warden's negligence. The Supt seemed to have thought that the fact that the prisoner escaped was itself evidence of negligence & Rince apparently did not think it necessary to hold any oral enquiry after the charge was framed. But I venture to submit that the whole case has been initiated by the non-observance of the procedure followed and it has seriously prejudiced the warden in that if he had had evidence the he might have been able to show that there was no gross or culpable negligence deserving dismissal which has now been imposed by the I.G.

19/7 S

Re U.S.'s criticism of procedure, I agree.

2. It has been argued also that this is an appeal, because the I.G. enhanced the punishment. I don't think this is so. Please consult your Police section. It affects our procedure here, I think.

21.6.40.

Any precedents in A section?

Two precedents are put up. Viz

(L) Go No. 3536 Home dated 18.7.1938 and

(R) Go No. 3856 Home dated 6.8.1938.

(L) 2 Go No. 3536 Home dated 18.7.38 related to a case in which the Dy. of Police passed an order of dismissal and acted under instructions from the Govt. and not on an appeal from the Sub. concerned. The representation to the Govt. was therefore treated as an appeal of instructions in para 12 of Go No 1112 Pub (Sec) dated 7.7.1939. The Jail Department case dealt with in this file is similar to this

(R) 3 Go No. 3856 Home dated 6.8.38 related to a case in which the Dy. enhanced the punishment on appeal. It was held that no appeal lay to the Govt. in that case as the

Dy.

*See D on page 63 & the note on pp 65-69 ibid

*See para 3 of IV & U.S.'s remarks at A on p 11 ibid

8 /

Jgs order was issued under rule 5(c) of the Penalties and Appeals Rules for the Madras Police Sub-Service and M-S-P Sub. Service.

Applied — M.S. Manual - Vol II under Fines up

Ans 26/x

Jw 26/10

Then see M on p 49 G.O 1102 Pub (Ser) d 7-7-39 This applies to this case and the petition must be treated as an appeal

The appeal lies here, as the I.G's order was not passed on appeal but on a reference from the Supt.

4/5.11.40.

The file of the C.J.Bellary shows ~~that~~ that the procedure in this case was as follows:--

The prisoner escaped on the 28th of March, and on the 29th of March the Supt. held an enquiry; in this enquiry, the appellant was examined along with others, con--victs and warders, and the Supt. put various questions to him turning on his responsibility; there were six other witnesses, and the appellant was asked whether he wished to cross--examine the witness, in two cases and not in the other four. On the 12th of April, the appellant was formal--ly ordered to show cause why he should not be dismissed for neglect of duty; it was then, for the first time, that he ap--peared as being the object of disciplinary enquiry, on the record; the order of the Supt. did not comply with the various requirements of the disciplinary-enquiry rules. On the 13th of April, and four days before the appellant sub--mitted his explanation, the Supt. wrote to the I.G., sending him copies of the depositions and saying that there could be no doubt that the appellant was slack in his duty and that, having already framed charges, he intended, on receiving the appellant's explanation, to reduce him in grade for one year; in reply to this, the I.G. wrote to the Supt., saying that the appellant deserved dismissal and asking if there were any extenuating circumstances. After (P.T.O.)

p-5 (X)

pp 8-25 (X)

pp 12 + 25 (X)

p-26 (X)

(K) + (G)

pp 27-28 (X)

p-2 (-)

receiving this letter, the Supt. passed an order, on the Appellant's explanation, finding his explanation un-satisfactory and ordering that, in place of dismissal, which he was inclined to order, the appellant should be reduced in grade for two years, in view of his long service and record; the Supt. then reported his order to the I.G., with the records, and the I.G. passed the order of dismissal that is now under appeal.

It is apparent that, whatever the merits of the case may be, the appellant was prejudiced, throughout the procedure outlined above, by neglect of the rules on procedure. The I.G. is requested to have the en-quiry held de novo and orders passed by the present Supt. of the Jail.

Issue orders in the above terms; the order is under S.I. 107 (though that, of course, will not appear in the order).

4/5/40

Draft revised

A draft order is submitted for approval.

5.11.40

5.11.40.

25
9/11

C.F.16.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

	Date.	Initials.
When received for fair copying ..		
When copied ..	9-11	
When examined...		
When signed ...		
When despatched.		

SUBJECT:— Home Dept.

Jails - Estt. - Arokiaswami, ex-warder, Central Jail, Bellary - Appeal against dismissal - ~~Orders passed~~. Defects in procedure pointed out and fresh enquiry ordered.

READ AGAIN _____, dated _____ 19____.

" " _____ " _____ 19____.

READ *ALSO*:—

p 1-7 CF No. 25722 From the DS. of Prisons Rge; No. 2548-B/40 dated 10.9.1940.

p 9 CF " 28069 " _____ " _____ " 3.10.1940.

" _____ " _____ " _____ " _____ 19____.

Order ~~Resolution~~ Ms. ~~Rout.~~ No. 4501, dated 9.11. 19 40

See by Secy

p-39 (X)

p 4-7 CF

(A)+ (X)

Dpd. by Van / Post / Messenger

Dpr.'s Initials. 9/11

193

I - ... wg note on p-8

N.F

In connection with the escape of a prisoner from the Central Jail, Bellary, Arokiaswami, ~~a~~ ex-warder in the jail, was dismissed from service by the DS. of Prisons. ~~He~~ the ex-warder has preferred an appeal to Govt. against the orders of dismissal. From the records of the case the Govt. find that the following procedure has been adopted in regard to enquiry and punishment:—

The prisoner escaped on 28.3.40 & the Enquiry held on evening on 29.3.40. In the course of the enquiry, the appellant was examined along with others,

(convicts and warders) and the Supdt put various questions to him touching on this responsibility. As there were 6 witnesses, the appellant was given the option to cross-examine only two of them. On 12.4.40, the appellant was formally ordered to show cause why he should not be dismissed for neglect of duty, and it was then, for the first time, that the appellant was informed that the order of the Supdt did not comply with the provisions of Ss. 112 Pub (Con.) D. 7.7.39 & So. 62 Pub (Ser.) D. 9.1.40. On 13.4.40, four days before the appellant submitted his explanation, the Supdt wrote to the DS., sending him copies of the depositions and saying that there could be no doubt that the appellant was slack in his duty and that, having already framed charges, he intended, on receiving the appellant's explanation, to reduce him in grade for one year. In reply to this, the DS wrote to the Supdt., saying that the appellant deserved dismissal and asking if there were any extenuating circumstances for not dismissing the warder. On receipt of this letter, the Supdt. passed an order on

he appeared as being the Subject of disciplinary enquiry, on record.

(K) & (Cr)

See p's note on p. 8 N.F

See p's note on p. 8 N.F

See p's note on p. 9 N.F

Corrp. ... on p. 9 N.F

the appellant's explanation, finding it unsatisfactory and ordering that, in place of dismissal which he was inclined to order, ~~the~~ the appellant shd. be reduced in grade for 2 years in view of his long service and record. The Supdt then reported his order to the DJ. with the records and the DJ. passed the order of dismissal.

It is apparent that the appellant was prejudiced through the procedure outlined above by neglect of the rules on procedure relating to disciplinary cases. The DJ. is requested to have the enquiry held de novo and orders passed by the present Supdt. of the Jail.

5.11.40

6.11.40.

To

The DJ. of Prisons

(with the records at 'A' & 'X')